

REMARKS

The present application was filed on March 30, 2000 with claims 1-16. Claims 7 and 14 have been canceled and claims 17-20 have been added. Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are pending, and claims 1 and 10 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated September 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,199,102 (hereinafter “Cobb”).

In this response, Applicants cancel claims 7 and 14, amend claims 1-5, 8-13, 15 and 16, and add claims 17-20. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cobb, claims 1-5, 8-13, 15 and 16 have been amended. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the method for preventing receipt by receivers of unwanted email sent by senders in a communication system comprises the step of determining whether email to a particular receiver comprises valid message authentication code (MAC) information. Further the method comprises the steps of filtering out email directed to the particular receiver that does not comprise valid MAC information at a gateway of the communication system, and providing the particular receiver with email directed to the particular receiver that comprises valid MAC information. Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite similar limitations. Support for these amendments can be found on pages 14 and 15 of the specification and FIGS. 2 and 4.

New claims 17-20 recite that the method also comprises the steps of determining if a particular sender is a registered sender of email to the particular receiver, wherein the particular sender becomes a registered sender by satisfying a requirement, and the particular sender is registered when the particular sender is determined not to be a registered sender of email to the particular receiver.

Cobb discloses a system for filtering unsolicited electronic commercial messages. In the Office Action, in rejecting claims 1-16, the Examiner refers to portions of Cobb regarding address verification and the providing of a “challenge” to an unrecognized sender. However, with regard to amended independent claims 1 and 10, Cobb fails to disclose a determination of whether email to a particular receiver comprises valid message authentication code (MAC) information. Cobb

contains no disclosure of MAC information and the prior art has not utilized MAC information in preventing receipt of unwanted email in a communication system.

Applicants assert that dependent claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15-20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 10. Dependent claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15-20 also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. For example, Cobb fails to disclose the establishment of an address and a key associated with a particular receiver that informs a sender of the ability to send email in a sender registration process, as recited in claim 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 26, 2005

Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547